

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 26 has been added. Claims 1-21 and 25-26 are pending and under consideration.

I. Objection to the Specification

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraphs 4-5, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to as exceeding 150 words. The abstract has been amended in response to this objection as indicated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. Objection to the Drawings

In the Office Action, at page 3, numbered paragraph 6, the Examiner indicated that drawings illustrating Figs. 1-276C, as referenced in the specification as originally filed, have not been submitted. In a telephone conversation with the Examiner on February 26, 2007, the undersigned confirmed with the Examiner that the original application, including drawings, as filed had been lost and that a replacement application, without drawings, had been submitted and scanned for the Examiner's review. As such, the drawings, as originally filed, are currently not before the Examiner. In response, drawing sheets illustrating Figs. 1-276C, as originally filed, are re-submitted herewith. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

III. Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action, at page 3, numbered paragraph 7, claim 5 was objected to as being of improper independent form. Claim 5 has been amended in response to this objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, numbered paragraphs 8-9, claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,034,914 to Osterlund.

Osterlund does not discuss or suggest:

in an open process for a file recorded on a magnetic tape, fixing a position of a head (hereinafter referred to as a real head position) relative to said magnetic tape at a predetermined position in said magnetic tape unit; and

when receiving a command directing to read an end-of-file label from said command issuing apparatus, executing emulation in

which a tape operation of reading said end-of-file label according to said command is virtually carried out in said magnetic tape unit without making said magnetic tape unit carry out a real tape operation,

as recited in amended claim 1. In other words, the invention of claim 1 provides for simplifying the tape operation accompanying the open process by *emulating the tape operation relating to an end-of-file identification* at the time of the open process for a file. In contrast, Osterlund provides an optical disk data storage system and method with interfaces having a buffer, which relates to an embedded directory technique that stores data on an optical disk for quick access. Osterlund relates to a technique by which a host operating system can use an optical disk storage system, instead of a magnetic tape unit, by using a general tape interface (general connection protocol), without correcting the software (Osterlund, col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 29). Therefore, Osterlund does not discuss or suggest *emulating the tape operation relating to an end-of-file identification* at the time of the open process for a file.

Since Osterlund does not discuss or suggest all of the features of the invention of claim 1, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 depends directly from claim 1, and includes all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the reference relied upon. Therefore, claim 6 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, at page 5, numbered paragraph 10, claims 2-5, 7-21, and 25 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As discussed above, none of the cited prior art discusses or suggests all of the features of the invention of claim 1. Claims 2-5, 7-21, and 25 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, and include all the features of claim 1, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the cited prior art. Therefore, claims 2-5, 7-21, and 25 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted above. Thus, it is submitted that claims 2-5, 7-21, and 25 are in a condition suitable for allowance.

VI. New Claim

New claim 26 has been added. With respect to the cited prior art, Osterlund does not discuss or suggest:

receiving a command directing to read an end-of-file label; and
executing emulation in which a tape operation of reading said end-of-file label according to said command is virtually carried out in said magnetic tape unit without making said magnetic tape unit carry out a real tape operation,

as recited in new claim 26. Therefore, claim 26 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 26 is in a condition suitable for allowance.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-27-07

By: 

Aaron C. Walker
Registration No. 59,921

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501